

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
10/690,704		SHTEIN ET AL.	
Examiner		Art Unit	
DAVID TUROCY		1792	

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

All Participants:

(1) DAVID TUROCY.

(2) Aaron Kamlay.

Date of Interview: 5 February 2010

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No
If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/David Turocy/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1792

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant's representative and examiner agreed to claim language to read over the prior art of record and place the case in immediate condition for allowance. The applicants representative agreed to more distinctly and positively claim the selection of process parameters to provide a dynamic pressure as claimed and more distinctly claim the patterned film. See detailed action the agreed upon amendment.